



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

the writer knows nothing whatever about the bees—would not know one species from another. He happened to be at the head of an expedition which, utterly unknown to him, collected a new species of bee, which was given his name. Why, then, should he be entitled to call it "Henderson's Bee"? Why not call *Motacilla alba*, white's wagtail, to be consistent? Baird is as much honored by speaking of the Baird Sparrow as by using the possessive. If the possessive is to be used, then it should be the name of the man who actually discovered the first recorded specimen, whether he is the one who described it or whose name was given to it, or not.

JUNIUS HENDERSON.

University of Colorado,  
Boulder, Colo.

#### A PRIZE BIRD DIARY

Editors of THE CONDOR:

An interesting ornithological study was recently successfully conducted by the children in Alameda, California. The children were invited to daily record during a given period of two months all birds which they actually themselves observed; to give the name of the bird, popular and scientific name when possible; to describe the bird's plumage; to say when, where and what the bird was doing at the time of observation; to state anything they knew of the habits, food or nature of the birds; whether resident or visitor; whether common or rare. The children were divided into two grades. Class A, 14 years of age to 10 years; Class B, all 10 years or under. Drawings of the birds were also asked for and thus a most interesting series of pictures of birds were obtained. Many of these pictures were colored and displayed marked ability on the part of the young artists. The number of birds observed and recorded by an individual student reached in some cases sixty, and forty different species, a record which not only indicated a very persistent search on the part of the student, but also an abundant local avifauna which was a revelation to the ordinary resident who from his limited field of observation concluded that there were no birds outside of a Sparrow and a Blackbird. Much interest was taken by parents and teachers and the experiment proved one of much attractiveness as well as one of considerable educational value. Prizes consisting of ornithological books were given to the most deserving students; the judges who examined the reports and upon whose decisions the prizes were awarded were the President, Vice President and Secretary of the Northern Division of the Cooper Club. The following birds were among those recorded: Western Gull, Cormorant, Pelican, Wild Ducks, Wild Geese, Great Blue Heron,

Night Heron, Rail, Sandpiper, Curlew, Willet, California Quail, Mourning Dove, Sharp-shinned Hawk, Red-tailed Hawk, Barn Owl, Burrowing Owl, California Woodpecker, Lewis Woodpecker, Red-shafted Flicker, Allen Hummingbird, Wood Pewee, Western Flycatcher, Blue Jay, Redwinged Blackbird, Meadow Lark, Oriole, Blackbird, Goldfinch, White-crowned Sparrow, Golden-crowned Sparrow, Oregon Junco, English Sparrow, Oregon Towhee, California Towhee, Grosbeak, Louisiana Tanager, Cliff Swallow, Barn Swallow, Cedar Waxwing, Shrike, Warbling Vireo, Lutescent Warbler, Yellow Warbler, Audubon Warbler, American Pipit, California Thrasher, Winter Wren, Parkman Wren, Nuthatch, Titmouse, Bush-Tit, Ruby-crowned Kinglet, Russet-backed Thrush, Dwarf Hermit Thrush, Robin, Varied Thrush, Blue Bird.

FREDERICK W. D'EVELYN

#### PUBLICATIONS REVIEWED

THE EYES AND EYESIGHT OF BIRDS, WITH ESPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE APPEARANCE OF THE FUNDUS OCULI, by CASEY A. WOOD, M. D., D. C. L., F. Z. S. (= Reprint from *Ophthalmology*, April, 1907, 24 pages, 2 colored plates, 8 illustrations in text.)

Eyesight and the structure of the eye is a most absorbing and interesting study. Since in birds vision reaches its highest expression, and since there are more wonderful adaptations of eye-structure in this class than in any other, surely a few moments spent in the consideration of bird's eyes will not be wasted.

The visual capacity of birds is very great. Dr. Wood takes the case of the humming-bird, which flies more rapidly than our eyes can possibly follow, and yet alights suddenly upon an almost invisible twig; of the woodcock, which flies rapidly thru dense forests, dodging every branch and twig; of the owl, which sees at night as well as it does in the day-time; and of the kingfisher, which can see in the water as well as in the air.

The author makes many original observations upon the likeness and unlikeness existent between the bird's eye and the human eye, taking up the bird's power of accommodation in some details. In this connection he quotes C. William Beebe, who asserts that a bird can transform his eye from a telescope to a microscope in a fraction of a second. A bird is able to see objects a quarter of a mile away which to us would be invisible, while on the other hand it can pick tiny seeds from the dust which we would need a magnifying glass to distinguish.

Much of the paper is devoted to a consideration of the ocular fundus, or the background of the eye as revealed by the use of the ophthalmoscope. Attention is called to the fact that

the regions of most distinct vision, called *macular* regions, and the depressions within their boundaries, called *foveæ* (singular, *fovea*), vary in position in different birds. In hawks, eagles, kingfishers, and insectivorous birds, which have the eyes placed upon the sides of the head so as to increase the size of the field of vision, two macular regions, and generally two foveæ, are found in the fundus of *each* eye. Dr. Wood infers from this that such birds have stereoscopic, or binocular vision in each eye, and accounts for their wonderful powers of fixation in this way. It is to be doubted whether this inference is correct. Binocular vision requires the production of *two similar images*. How could two images be formed in the same eye with only one lens?

That peculiar organ, the pecten or marsupium, comes in for a share of the discussion. This body is possessed by every bird. It stretches out from the ocular fundus into the vitreous humour almost to the lens. The form and complexity of the pecten vary much in different species. Its function may be to assist in pushing the crystalline lens forward during accommodative efforts, and it may also have something to do with the nourishing of the non-vascular structures within the eyeball.

Dr. Wood asserts that the background of the eye furnishes certain data of value in classification, since "wild species present invariable ophthalmoscopic pictures." On the whole the paper is very readable and well worth consideration.—WALTER P. TAYLOR.

THE BIRDS OF THE CHICAGO AREA, by FRANK M. WOODRUFF, is a bulletin which, in many respects, is a model of what a local list should be. It contains a full description of the territory included in the Chicago area, its climatic influences, and localities of interest; the latter of special interest to not only local but visiting ornithologists.

Many of the conditions opposed to birds are well brought out and one can well comprehend why many species once so plentiful about the head of the lake are now rarely seen.

A dozen full-page half-tones illustrate in a striking manner the more prominent features of the topography. The "List" itself contains 316 species and subspecies, and shows a great amount of careful research. It includes, besides the scientific and common names, all the synonyms, both popular and scientific.

One thing, however, is painfully evident and that is the very small amount of information regarding our birds which has been obtained during the past fifteen years. Mr. Woodruff has been indefatigable in his investigations,

but aside from an occasional record by one of the few ornithologists of this locality he has confined himself almost entirely to his own personal observations. This fact, and because of the size of the area, some parts of which were visited only at intervals of many years, makes the records scattering and often twenty years apart. To overcome this dearth of notes, Nelson's "Birds of Northeastern Illinois" has been quoted so frequently as to make the list, at times, seem more of a compilation than a record of up-to-date observations. Of about fifty birds listed there is nothing noted since 1876. It is therefore evident that many of these species should either be placed in a hypothetical list or else something more recent than a record of thirty-one years standing discovered in regard to them.

It is, however, fortunate for Chicago ornithology that there is one man among its two million inhabitants who has not succumbed entirely to the spirit of commercialism which prevades the Chicago area, and that he has had the courage to put in the shape of a list the results of twenty-five years labor.

Nelson 1876, Ridgway 1889 and 1895, and Woodruff in 1906, are all epoch making periods and we can only express regret that such long intervals elapse between them.

A bibliography, and an index of both scientific and common names, complete a very commendable effort.—F. S. D.

STATE OF NEW YORK; FOREST, FISH AND GAME COMMISSION; 1902-1903, 8th and 9th Reports; Royal 8 vo., pages 456; half tones 156, 38 in color, 20 of them birds.—This is one of the most handsome state reports of its nature ever gotten up; and in the fullness of the ground gone over, the forest and game articles will prove instructive as well as interesting reading. There are two ornithological papers, dealing with "Birds as Conservators of the Forest" and "The Wild Fowls of the St. Lawrence River." The former article is by Dr. F. E. L. Beal, the expert bird-food authority. New York has chosen well a man to show them the beneficial office of birds as destroyers of forest insect pests.

Dr. Beal opens his paper with an account of "Birds that Destroy Insects": how their busy lives are spent in hunting down the hoards of noxious insects that are daily attacking the forest trees. He mentions how some insects are supposed to be protected by their color, smell or taste; but stomach examination proves otherwise as to the keen senses and sharp appetites of their feathered enemies. In many cases where species of insects had strong odors and rank taste which were thought to protect them, these very species were found to form a very important percentage of the birds' food, often eaten to a varying extent by nearly all

1 The Chicago Academy of Sciences | — | The Birds of the Chicago Area | by | Frank Morley Woodruff | — | Bulletin No. VI | of | The Natural History Survey | — | Issued April 15, 1907; pp. 1 222, frontispiece, plates I-XI, all half-tones.